

LIBRARY
COLLEGE OF PUGET SOUND
AMERICAN BROADCASTING COMPANY
TACOMA, WASH.



8:30 p.m., E.W.T., AUGUST 9, 1945

Town Meeting



Bulletin OF AMERICA'S
TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR
Sponsored by THE READER'S DIGEST

What Does the British Election Mean To Us?

Moderator, GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.

Speakers

ORSON WELLES
MANCHESTER BODDY

CARL HINSHAW
JOHN FRANCIS NEYLAN

(See also page 12)

COMING AUGUST 23rd

Topic to be announced later pending
current events.

TUNE IN EVERY THURSDAY, AMERICAN BROADCASTING COMPANY—8:30 p.m., E.W.T.

★ ★ ★ CONTENTS ★ ★ ★

The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE BROADCAST OF AUGUST 9:

"What Does the British Election Mean To Us?"

<i>Mr. DENNY</i>	3
<i>Mr. WELLES</i>	4
<i>Mr. NEYLAN</i>	7
<i>Mr. BODDY</i>	9
<i>Congressman HINSHAW</i>	11
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN	12
QUESTIONS, PLEASE!	17

THE BROADCAST OF AUGUST 16:

"Will the Returning Soldier Be a Problem?"

(SEE PREVIEW IN BULLETIN OF AUGUST 2)

THE BROADCAST OF AUGUST 23:

Topic to be announced later pending
current events.

The Broadcast of August 9, 1945, originated in the Riverside Memorial Auditorium, Riverside, California, from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., E.W.T., over the American Broadcasting Company Network.

Town Meeting is published weekly by *The Reader's Digest*. Town Meeting Publication Office: 32 South Fourth St., Columbus 15, Ohio. Send subscriptions to Town Hall, 123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N.Y. Subscription price, \$4.50 a year, 10c copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1897.



Town Meeting

Bulletin of America's Town Meeting of the Air



George V. Denny, Jr., Moderator

What Does the British Election Mean To Us?

Announcer:

The Reader's Digest, America's most widely read magazine, welcomes you to another stirring session of America's Town Meeting, the program that gives you both sides of issues affecting your life and mine. Tonight, George V. Denny, Jr., returns as your moderator and the program this evening comes to you from the Riverside Memorial Auditorium in Riverside, California. We're the guests of station KPRO and a special Town Meeting Host Committee.

Now, to open this discussion of a question that may have an influence on the future of our own government, *The Reader's Digest* brings you the founder and moderator of America's Town Meeting, Mr. George V. Denny, Jr. Mr. Denny. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Good evening, neighbors. It's great to be back on the job with you after a grand vacation and in

time for the momentous events of the past week.

With the news of the development of the atomic bomb, tonight's subject becomes more important than ever, for we must remember that British scientists and, therefore, the British people, are partners with us in the ownership and control of this great new weapon which may be used for good or evil, as we determine.

What do the British elections mean to us? What does it mean to us, after all, what kind of government the people have in England, in Spain, in France, in Russia, or China? We once said that it didn't matter what kind of government the people of Germany, Italy, or Japan had until we discovered that governments, like neighbors, were subject to infectious diseases, not too easy to confine to national boundaries.

Indeed, it matters greatly to us what the policies of the new government of Britain will be for we

are a very close partner of theirs. It matters to our government whether the British elections represent a trend of thinking over there or merely a local reaction to the Churchill regime.

It matters to us and to Britain, with whom our common secret is shared. Ever since Major Tom Ferebee dropped that first atomic bomb on Hiroshima, it matters to every human being in the world how this great new power is to be used and who controls it. It matters terribly to each one of us that no government on this planet be free to start another world war.

So when we discuss the question, "What Do the British Elections Mean to Us?" we must do so in the light of the stirring events of the past few days, certainly the most momentous in our lifetime, probably the most momentous in the history of man's inhabitancy on this globe.

Four eminent Americans, Manchester Boddy, editor and publisher of the *Los Angeles Daily News*; Congressman Carl Hinshaw, Republican of California; Orson Welles, actor, producer, and newspaper columnist; and John Francis Neylan, attorney of San Francisco, will lead our discussion.

I take pleasure at this time in presenting our first speaker, a man of many talents, an outstanding star of stage, and screen, and radio, who, in recent years, has also turned his talents to public

affairs as columnist and editor of a magazine called *The Free World*, Mr. Orson Welles. Mr. Welles. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Welles:

I overheard two Englishmen discussing the elections.

"It's awfully bad for securities," said one.

"It's awfully good for insecurities," said the other.

The new Labor Government means more public buying post-war, and makes Britain a much better customer for the United States. That ought to be good news for Wall Street. But these days, nothing seems to be good news for Wall Street except disaster. The big business boys are still talking as if they were scared stiff of full employment and the prosperity that goes with it.

The new line of the American reactionaries goes like this: Less help for Britain—as little as possible. American money must not be used to support a Labor Government in Britain. Economic sanctions, in other words, proposed by those who refused the help of sanctions to Spanish democracy.

But there are also the well-intentioned middle - of - the - roaders, admirers of the admirable Mr. Churchill, who mourn his sudden passing from political life and tremble at the promised crisis of a capitalist America, isolated in a socialist world.

These timid citizens need to be told again, and again, and again, that we live in a great, rich grown-up Nation, with nothing to fear but fear itself. These patriots of the profit system should mark it down on their calendars that if America is ever truly isolated it will be by American isolationists.

Winston Churchill truly spoke for English courage when England stood alone. But there was—there is—another, an offensive war for which he never spoke. Its objectives are more than military and its partisans assume that when you win a war, you win something. But the leader of the Conservative Party only convinced his electorate that he wanted to win something back—normalcy.

That's also what our Tories here at home call it. It means about the same thing over there—a synonym for the past, for slums and unemployment, for the dole and for Munich.

It's not for Mr. Tommy Atkins at the Front, thank you, and not for Mrs. Atkins, fresh from the buzz-bombs. They aren't having any more of that normalcy. Right now the Atkins' need a new house and are hoping for a bit of decent leisure to enjoy it. Also they want some better schooling for Tommy, Jr.—a better chance for him in a better England.

But Winnie wasn't having any of that—or very little. All he promised was the same old thing,

or maybe a bit less of it. So they cheered him because they love him, and they voted him out of power.

Ungrateful? I don't think so. Winnie encouraged them marvelously in the dark days but the record shows that they were quite a source of encouragement to Winnie. It turns out that the heroic, solitary stand of Britain with its back to the wall, the stand he so bravely spoke for, was made by the entire population of the English island. It wasn't all his blood, his sweat, and his tears. It seems it was exactly those who did the most bleeding, and sweating, and weeping, who asked him, please, to step down.

The people are generally right about these things. They never abandoned Winston Churchill. It was he who abandoned the people.

Not a few newspaper readers devoutly fear that England has gone communist. Unhappily, on these shores, labor is often considered to be a sort of dirty word. To the intellectual casualties of the yellow press, that word labor evokes a grimy-faced subhuman cartoon foreigner, brandishing bombs and picket signs. To the innocents who have bought this bogey at the newsstands, something called a Labor Government, even as far away as Merrie England, sounds as reassuring as the cry of "fire" in a crowded movie palace.

Now it's true that the Con-

servative Party was defeated by the crowded millions who work for their living. And its fiercest opponents were those whose living comes from other men's work. But the fact is that this new labor administration received its record-smashing vote, not from an angry and faceless multitude in greasy overalls, but rather that tidily-dressed majority which is always the despair of revolutionary conspirators, I mean the middle class.

In Britain the average man has finally voted for himself. This means a brightened hope for economic democracy and because the average Englishman is inflexibly the champion of his own very individual rights, the future looks better for political democracy in Europe as well as Britain, yes, and in the United States and the U.S.S.R.

Be sure that the average Englishman who voted in the Labor Government, the solid citizenry of the cathedral towns, the sober country folk and the cautious professional men, the doctors, and dentists, and lawyers, and civil servants, the merchants, and the small businessmen of London's suburbs have none of them sprouted Bolshevik beards and are none of them spouting the slogans of a world revolution by the proletariat.

In Britain, a great experiment has been commenced, as significant in history as the experiments which led up to the atomic bomb. It is

based on the proposition that economic democracy and political democracy can live together. The triumph in a free election of Britain's Labor Party is therefore heartening, not only to American labor, but to our huge and hopeful majority. It threatens merely the greedy few, the monopolists, the cartelisters, the labor baiters, the race haters.

Britain's new government is bad news for Japanese imperialism and for British imperialism and for American economic imperialism. It speaks the first affirmative word for India, for all the colonial plague spots, including Puerto Rico, and this democratic victory is peace insurance for eastern Europe, for the Near East—perhaps even for China. It spells death to the gangster, Franco. It threatens Salazar of Portugal, yes, and Colonel Peron of fascist Argentina. Also, the Progressive's progress in England is just as bad for the American fascist as he says it is.

Honest Americans who are shocked at the defeat of British Toryism need only to be reminded that the British Tories are no friends of ours. We once fought a war against them. It was by peaceful ballot that the English people signed their declaration of independence. The American Revolution was more bloody. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Orson Welles. Thank you for a highly provocative state-

ment. Now, we're expecting a stiff rejoinder from the distinguished San Francisco attorney, Mr. John Francis Neylan, who'll speak to us from San Francisco. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Neylan:

I am delighted to note from Mr. Welles' remarks that it's permissible once more to mention in polite society the American Revolution through which this country became an independent Nation. May I express limited agreement with Mr. Welles, also, about the British Tories. While I do not think it necessary to resurrect their ancient faults, I believe it wise to keep in mind that in this troubled world the British Socialist — like the British Tory — will be thinking primarily of British interests.

The recent British election may be the final step in the passing of Europe as a dominating factor in world economy, and may place on our shoulders prematurely a single leadership for which we are ill prepared.

The only conceivable basis for such fantastic economic conceptions as the Bretton Woods and other financial agreements was that we would have the cooperation of a group of amazingly able men in the city of London who have managed England's financial, shipping, manufacturing, and insurance ventures throughout the world.

Eighty per cent of the people in so-called civilized countries must

have peacetime jobs to get enough food to exist tomorrow; and to put peaceful industry, commerce, and agriculture in motion is a heartbreaking task to all but political orators.

Europe has lived off the rest of the world for centuries because it had the military and economic power. Yorktown marked the beginning of the end of Europe's political dominance and two world wars have left her prostrate economically.

No one recognized these facts more clearly than the incomparable Churchill, who spoke as a historian as well as a statesman when he scorned to promise the war-weary British what he termed a cheap jack Utopia.

With characteristic vision, honesty, and courage, he told them the truth that the road back to prosperity was to be long, steep, and wearisome. In the days of military defeat and imminent disaster, the British rallied to his program of "blood, sweat, and tears." But in the days of victory, they succumbed to the siren's song of socialism which has enticed one European nation after another to its destruction.

Disguising the ancient and hateful doctrine of the all-powerful state under new labels, assorted politicians in Russia, Italy, Germany, France, and Spain have thrown Europe back politically and

intellectually to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Attlee and his associates promised the weary free men of England an economic paradise if they would vest the politicians with the power to socialize finance, industry, manufacturing, and commerce. It is the same old formula—the government can do no wrong and paradise is always over the next hill, if the people will only give the politicians more power.

I can see nothing in the condition of Europe today to inspire faith in the omniscience or efficiency or promises of politicians. On the contrary, that devastated, hungry, bewildered, and despairing continent is a horrible example of the effects of the political ideology of the all-powerful state.

Here in America, we, too, are running away from the truth. We do not want to face the facts of a 300 billion dollar national debt, and we hate anyone who tells us the postwar world is not going to be an uninterrupted era of prosperity.

In these days of atomic energy, we are reveling in intellectual inertia. We have abolished the rules of arithmetic and discarded the lessons of history, but we'd better waken to the fact that instead of having the assistance of the world's greatest traders in rehabilitating world economy, we may see England go the way France, under the Front Populaire when Leon Blum

and his fellow Socialists socialized French finance and industry.

There are some comforting thoughts, however. Across from Attlee in the House of Commons will sit, as the leader of His Majesty's opposition, the man who in the '30s was laughed at when he warned Europe and England against nazism, fascism, and communism.

There will be no ironclad press censorship in England to prevent the outside world from learning of the beauties of the all-powerful state, so we will enjoy a ringside seat.

Already, it seems to be generally recognized that the Bretton Woods and other international financial agreements, which were rushed through so precipitately, will need reconsideration. Certainly no one with even an elementary knowledge of economics would suggest that the bad capitalist United States, fighting a full-scale war and burdened with more debt than all other nations combined, can or should finance these socialistic parades in peace as well as in war.

Throughout the centuries all civilized men have struggled to be free from the dictates of those who held political power whether they were kings, emperors, or functionaries with other titles. Thirty years ago, the Hohenzollerns, Hapsburgs, Romanovs, and Bourbons were powerful kings and emperors. Today they are forgotten.

Some of the dictators who followed them have already passed on. Politicians come and go, but man's yearning for liberty is as eternal as the immortal soul which distinguishes him from the docile, dumb animals.

The war-weary British experimented with the Socialist Ramsay MacDonald, after World War I—then drove him from power. It seems unfortunate for them, for us, and for the world at large that they picked this time to go on another political spree, but don't forget it was Englishmen who wrote the Magna Carta. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Neylan. And now for the opinion of the distinguished editor and publisher of the *Los Angeles Daily News*, Mr. Manchester Boddy. Mr. Boddy. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Boddy:

Mr. Neylan sounds the keynote for his school of thought when he rather joyfully quotes Winston Churchill having told the people of England "the road back to prosperity is going to be long, steep, and wearisome."

What those gentlemen have overlooked is that you can't go back to a place you have never been. I hope Congressman Hinshaw will help Mr. Neylan tell us just when the British people ever lived in that state of prosperity to which Mr. Churchill would restore them

over a long, steep, and wearisome road.

When did an English working man ever own a home of his own? When did he ever own a few acres of good earth? An automobile? When was he ever able to rise above his class and look any man straight in the eye and tell him "compete with me on a basis of equal opportunity"?

If the masses in England had enjoyed the equality of rights enjoyed by the masses in the United States, they would never surrender such rights to government, to private monopolies, or to any other authority including politicians.

Mr. Neylan condemned politicians seven different times. It sounded grand. When a public official agrees with you, he is a statesman. When he disagrees, he is a politician.

When big business owns government, according to Mr. Neylan, it is a government of statesmen. When the government owns big business, it is a government of politicians.

Here in America, Mr. Neylan said, we, too, are running away from the truth. We do not want to face the fact of a 300 million dollar debt and we hate anyone who tells us the postwar world is not going to be an uninterrupted era of prosperity.

Well, let's face the real truth, Mr. Neylan. We have learned to split the atom. That discovery

alone is an asset worth a hundred times more than the amount of our national debt. I should like to ask Congressman Hinshaw and Mr. Neylan if they would turn that asset over to the tender mercies of our huge collectivist industrial empires? Would they turn that over to the munitions makers?

Specifically, I would like to have either or both of them explain where they would put the value of that discovery—the greatest in all human history—on Uncle Sam's ledger.

Mr. Neylan sees in the British election the socialization of British industry. He argues that the United States will follow suit. He sees our Government becoming totalitarian, a collectivist state.

I want to say to Mr. Neylan that the time has come to say right out in the open that our colossal aggregations of capital in the United States are not symbols either of free enterprise or private initiative. (*Applause.*) Oh, they started that way but inevitably they became so big, so powerful, that today their impact is felt all over the world.

By collectivist industry, I mean our gallant "five-star generals," such as General Petroleum, General Electric, General Motors, and the other generals with which you are all familiar. (*Applause.*) Their impact is so great that it affects the welfare and the daily lives of millions of citizens from one corner

of this continent to the other. It laps over and affects the lives of people outside the United States. They no longer practice or tolerate economic democracy. They are collectivist by their very natures and only a few theoretical steps removed from that collectivist state that Mr. Neylan fears, and get this, Mr. Neylan, collectivism in industry begets collectivism in government. I repeat—collectivism in industry begets collectivism in government. That's how it got there.

If you would preserve economic and political democracy in the United States, you must start by restoring real economic democracy to the people. As matters stand today, the issue is whether collectivist industry shall own government or whether government shall own collectivist industry.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, that issue in England was settled through the ballot box — not through a Putsch, not through bloody revolution. It will be settled here when our collectivist industry decides to restore economic democracy to the people. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Manchester Boddy. Now I expect we are going to hear a slightly different opinion from our fourth speaker who represents that other paradise valley known as the San Fernando Valley. Congressman Carl Hinshaw, Republi-

can of California. Congressman Hinshaw. (*Applause.*)

Congressman Hinshaw:

Mr. Boddy says that the recent discovery of how to split the atom is worth a hundred times our national debt. Well, a hundred times 300 million is 30 trillion dollars. It sounds like more New Deal high finance to me. (*Laughter and applause.*)

But to get back to the subject of tonight's discussion, evidently, the British wanted a change of administration and they got it. In all probability, if the British national election had been held a year ago, as ours was in America, Mr. Churchill's administration would have been supported by a majority of the English people, just as the Roosevelt Administration was supported here. The war was on then and the public psychology favored the incumbent. But even at that, Mr. Roosevelt's popular majority was greatly reduced in 1944.

The British, by agreement, waited until the war in Europe had been won before holding their election. The pressure was off and all their emotions stolidly held back for six long years—their inward chafing at wartime restrictions, rules, regulations, rationing, black-outs, bombings, casualties, and all the terrible dread of war—was released.

The stream of blood, sweat, and tears had been crossed by July 5,

so they took a deep breath and changed horses. That is not a new departure. It is a common occurrence both in England and in America. When the war in Japan is finished, we, too, may have a change of Administration. (*Applause.*)

Our people wanted that change in 1944, but fear, fear that the war might last a day longer if they changed horses, held them back. Fear will not rule them in 1946, and certainly not in 1948.

The American people have long been sick and tired of the thousands of rules and regulations and the petty tyrannies of the Washington bureaucrats. We, in America, will probably want a change, too.

It is interesting to note that historically American political thought and popular inclination toward political parties has generally won opposite to the prevailing thought and political complexion of the British. When Britain has been radical, we have been conservative, and vice versa.

Those Gallup polls that have proved themselves to be within one per cent correct, bear out that statement. The latest poll shows conclusively that American public opinion is now turning strongly to the right, back toward the center.

Mr. Truman faces a dilemma. If he moves to the left, he can easily lose the conservative demo-

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

GEORGE ORSON WELLES — Frequently called the Boy Wonder, Orson Welles in his few years has been a jack of all trades and, surprisingly, has been master of most. Born in Kenosha, Wisconsin, in 1915, he early showed signs of being a child prodigy. He attended the Todd School at Woodstock, Illinois, and at the age of 16 was an actor with the Gate Theatre in Dublin, Ireland. Since then he has been actor, writer, director, and producer for radio, stage and screen. To these achievements he has recently added the roles of newspaper columnist and lecturer on world events.

JOHN FRANCIS NEYLAN — Although he was born in New York City, Mr. Francis has lived in California most of his life. He studied at Seton Hall College in New Jersey and was admitted to the California bar in 1916. Since 1917 he has practiced law in San Francisco. He is a regent of the University of California and a director of the San Francisco Opera Association.

JOHN CARL WILLIAM HINSHAW — Republican from California, Mr. Hinshaw has been a member of Congress since 1939. Born in Chicago, in 1894, he has a Civil Engineering degree from Princeton and was a graduate student at the School of Business of the University of Michigan. After two years in the U.S. Army he resigned with a rank of captain.

After the war Mr. Hinshaw was employed in various managerial capacities in automotive manufacturing and sales until 1927. He then entered the field of investments and banking. In 1929 he moved to California where he entered the real estate and insurance businesses.

Becoming active in civic affairs and politics he was a member of various local and state political groups before his election to Congress.

E. MANCHESTER BODDY — Editor and publisher, was born in Lake Tapps, Washington, in 1891. He attended Washington State College and the University of Montana. For several years he was sales director for the *Encyclopedia Britannica* and manager of distribution for *Current History* and *Mid-Week Pictorial*. In 1920 he organized the Mexican Year Book Publishing Company. In 1922 he became director of sales, printing, and binding departments of the *Los Angeles Times Mirror* press, but after a year he became publisher, principal owner, and editor of the *Huntington Park Signal* and *Los Angeles Illustrated Daily News*. The *Los Angeles Evening Post-Record* was acquired in January, 1935. At present he is editor and publisher of the *Los Angeles Daily News*.

During World War I, Mr. Boddy served as a first lieutenant in the U.S. Army and was injured in the battle of Argonne Forest.

cratic support he needs, and I'll say that a lot of Republicans like him, too. And if he doesn't move to the left, the socialistic wing of the Democratic Party may cut loose and form a third party, which might take, nationally, the name of the American Labor Party, which is now confined to New York. They may cut loose anyway, as they are none too pleased evidently, with the present setup.

In recent months, the radical and conservative Democrats in the Congress of the United States have had a noticeable tendency toward

moving apart, and even sitting apart from each other. Two fundamentally separate groups are beginning to jell. The British election may accentuate that separatist movement among the Democrats in our own Congress until the division becomes permanent.

The British Labor Party leaders have proposed that their government should take and operate and manage certain British industries—among them the British coal mines. Certainly something drastic must be done about the British coal mines. The shafts are so deep and

the equipment is so obsolete and the cost of getting out the coal is so high that British coal mining is no longer a profitable industry. I wouldn't be a bit surprised if the British mine owners would be very glad to have their mines taken over by their government.

But I would be very much surprised if John L. Lewis' coal miners would want the American mines taken over and operated permanently by our Federal Government.

It will be interesting to us in America to watch the British experiment in government ownership of industries. We, in America, have long considered certain natural resources and facilities used in common as proper fields for governmental activity.

Government in America, both Republican and Democrat, has built and operated some of the greatest hydro-electric plants in the world. Many of our cities have municipally-owned power plants, as here in Riverside, and the Rural Electrification program is a popular undertaking in the country districts. We have our public schools and our roads and highways and our state universities, our federal reserve bank, and the land banks, and a host of other activities.

But we have believed that Government ownership and operation should not go beyond these natural fields for public enterprise and that industry, commerce, and agriculture

thrive best under a system of competitive, private enterprise. It is the foundation of the great economic strength of our country. If the British can do better than we by putting industry under government ownership, this will be their chance to prove it. But neither Britain nor Russia could have survived without the help of the powerful force of the individual initiative, which is the backbone of United States of America. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Congressman Hinshaw. Now will you gentlemen join me up here around the microphone and see if we can't iron out some of these differences with a brief discussion. How about it, Mr. Welles?

Mr. Welles: All right. This is for Mr. John Francis Neylan who says that in the British government just elected, there will be no "ironclad press censorship to prevent the outside world from learning of the beauties of the all-powerful state."

This isn't my question but if the British state is going to be all-powerful, why does Mr. Neylan assume that there will be a free press? That a socialist economy brings with it, by some mystical inevitability, political terrorism is, of course, Mr. Neylan's assumption and nothing more.

Now here is my question. Mr. Neylan grants that he doesn't expect anything but an entirely free press from socialist England. I wonder if it is possible that Mr. Neylan agrees with me that, regardless of how they may choose to order their economy, Englishmen will always insist that their government be directly responsible to them. That if the British people want to choose by free election the men who will have the final say on the doings and the disposition of big business, it does not follow that they seek or will permit the abandonment of England's classical, political, and social liberties.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Neylan in San Francisco.

Mr. Neylan: It is hard to identify that as a question. However, I think I know what Mr. Welles has in mind. At the close of my remarks, if you will recall, I suggested that we keep in mind that Englishmen wrote the Magna Charta. I do not believe the English people in sober thought will permit the socialist government to suppress the press as it has been suppressed in these other socialistic paradises in Europe. And I believe with a free press the English people will win back any liberties they lose.

Mr. Welles: I want to ask Mr. Neylan, if I may, George, why if socialism means censorship of press and totalitarianism, in the assumption of Mr. Neylan—not of most

political scientists—why the press is not censored in the Labor governments of Australia and New Zealand?

Mr. Neylan: My impression is that the press has been so heavily censored that the people of the world today are ill-informed. There never was an intelligent censorship in the history of the world and there can't be one because men do not write critical autobiographies of themselves.

Now in Australia, the people there put in a Labor Government, but like Englishmen in England, they are conscious of the fundamental rights.

Ramsay MacDonald with a socialist government went into England when the people were weary after the last war. With a short period of power, the English people, thoughtful of their fundamental rights, turned MacDonald out, and I believe that's what they will do with Attlee.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Neylan. Mr. Boddy, do you want to get in on this?

Mr. Boddy: Well, I have one fundamental question. What I am trying to establish here is that I believe that the elections in Britain merely point out an inevitable sequence. The British government did socialize major industry because of the necessities of war. Now the British people said if we have emergencies after the war,

why shouldn't we continue the same operation?

I should like to ask Congressman Hinshaw or Mr. Neylan to distinguish between economic democracy and those colossal collectivist industries that do not practice economic democracy and explain to us how there can be collectivist industry and not collectivist government at the same time.

Mr. Denny: I am afraid you are asking for more than a five-minute speech here, Mr. Boddy, but let's see what Congressman Hinshaw will do with that.

Congressman Hinshaw: Well, curiously enough, Mr. Denny, the present Administration has very definitely fostered the collectivist industry. It is very evident, during the course of this war, that a very, very high percentage of the war orders have gone to the so-called collectivist industries and the small manufacturers of this country have had one terrible time not only to get orders but to keep them once they have gotten them because in this let-down period which we are experiencing now, these larger corporations are hauling in their sub-contracts and running the small manufacturers out of business.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Neylan, yes.

Mr. Neylan: In response to Mr. Boddy, I'd like to ask him if, after all of the power his political heroes have had during the last 13

years, we have collectivist industry in America?

Mr. Denny: Mr. Boddy?

Mr. Boddy: Yes, sir. The time for big business has passed because it has to become collectivist by its very nature. It is no longer the economic democracy that it once was and it does not represent what we mean today by private initiative and private enterprise. It started small, became bigger and bigger, and bigger until it took upon itself all of the characteristics of the collectivist state and that is what started the trend toward collectivist government 13 years ago. As long as you have collectivist industry, it will always beget its child, collectivist government.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Neylan?

Mr. Neylan: Mr. Boddy's heroes have been in power 13 years. The implication of his statement is that they have fostered this collectivist industry. Now I'd like to ask Mr. Boddy if he advocates turning over to operation by politicians—that is, the government—General Electric, General Motors, Ford Motor Car Company, General Petroleum, and these other industries to which he referred?

Mr. Boddy: No sir, Mr. Neylan, I do not. I call upon those five-star generals to preserve economic democracy in the United States by at once instituting a plan of decentralization to the end that the people of Riverside, Los Angeles, Schenectady, and all the other com-

munities of the United States may participate through individuals of those communities and be free from the totalitarian domination of industries representing billions of dollars in central locations in the East.

I do not want them taken over by government, but if they insist upon being totalitarian by their nature, they will beget a government that is collectivist and I am against that.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Neylan, let Mr. Welles come in on this, please.

Mr. Welles: I want to ask Mr. Neylan if I understood him correctly. He said that big business has not been doing so well under the heroes of Mr. Boddy. Does he mean to imply that big business did worse under Mr. Hoover?

Mr. Neylan: No. On the contrary, I have been fighting the abuses in business since before Mr. Welles was born. I was shocked to have Mr. Boddy suggest that in the last 13 years, with all of the power in the hands of his political heroes, we had passed into a system of collective industry in the United States, and I'd like to know what is going to become of the hundreds of thousands and millions of

workers who have jobs in those plants today if they are destroyed.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Neylan. I know you gentlemen could keep this up indefinitely but there is a representative audience of more than 2,000 people of Riverside, California, and this area, here in the audience. They are eager to ask some questions so while you get ready to answer them, let's pause briefly for station identification.

Announcer: You are listening to America's Town Meeting, the program that gives both sides of questions vitally important to you, sponsored by the most widely read of all magazines, *The Reader's Digest*.

Tonight, Actor Orson Welles, Editor Manchester Boddy, Representative Carl Hinshaw, and Attorney John Francis Neylan are discussing the topic, "What Does the British Election Mean to Us?"

For a complete copy of this discussion, including the question period immediately following, send for the Town Meeting Bulletin. Just write to Town Hall, New York 18, New York, and enclose ten cents to cover the cost of printing and mailing. And now, Mr. Denny.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. Denny: Thank you, and now we're ready for the questions from this fine Riverside audience. We'll start with this beautiful blonde right down here on the second row. All right.

Lady: My question is for Mr. Welles. I read that the United States is capitalistic in a socialistic world. Then why did a British Labor constituent say, "Let's have socialism as it is in the United States"?

Mr. Welles: Well, I'm not acquainted with the quote. Are you, George? Do you know the Labor constituent who asked that?

Mr. Denny: No. What's the significance of the quote and who made it?

Lady: I heard it on a newscast.

Mr. Welles: I'm not responsible for newscasts.

Mr. Denny: The lady right here. Yes?

Lady: Congressman Carl Hinshaw. Do you believe that England's monarchy, although a figure-head type of government, will be abolished soon?

Congressman Hinshaw: Well, that's a question, my dear lady, that you will have to ask the British. I doubt it, because nearly all the English people seem to hold the Crown in very high regard. The Crown does not enter into the politics of Britain, but merely acts,

as Mr. Denny does here, as a moderator.

Mr. Denny: All right. Thank you. The gentleman in uniform there, yes?

Man: Mr. Neylan. Do you believe the Labor victory in Britain will affect our government economic policies toward the Left or Right?

Mr. Neylan: Whether it will affect our policies toward the Left or Right, I think that the sole consideration for us in the Bretton Woods agreement, and these other financial arrangements, was that we would have the help of England in reestablishing world economy. Mr. Welles has said that this is the end of British imperialism. I question that. British political imperialism has been dead since 1931—the Statute of Westminster. However, the British, in world economy, fill a place that we are not prepared to fill, and if we're going to get world industry going again, it's all-important that those very able men in England who handled industry, finance, insurance, shipping, and so on, shall bear their share.

Otherwise, we are going to face world chaos, and you cannot get industry overnight or by political speeches. You have to get it through the hard work of men who know how.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr.

Neylan. Now, the gentleman here on the third row.

Man: Mr. Manchester Boddy. May we expect any change in the policy of the British government regarding the White Paper of 1939, which at present prohibits Jewish immigration into Palestine?

Mr. Boddy: Thank you for that question. As chairman of the Los Angeles for Palestine Committee, I can say that I have investigated that point and I am happy to tell you that the consensus seems to be that now, with a change of government, the Labor Party fortified with continuous resolutions in favor of Palestine being opened to the Jews, will have an excellent chance.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Boddy, I believe you also wanted to answer the first question.

Mr. Boddy: I do because I heard that same newscast and it's a very intelligent question. I think that the reason he made the expression he did is because, to the average British laborer, he thinks that when he sees an American workingman able to own his own home, an acre or two, an automobile, his wife well dressed, and at least able to hold his head up with his fellowmen, he says, "My God, that is Socialism come true," and I think that's why he said it. Thank you. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: All right. Thank you. The officer here.

Man: Mr. Welles. Would you care to comment on the influence you think the success of the New Deal had on the British election?

Mr. Welles: That's a splendid question, sir. I think it had a profound influence. In spite of Mr. Neylan's statement to the effect that before the New Deal there were no monopolies or trusts, I believe that the New Deal had quite a good deal to do in that direction toward the inhibition of monopolistic practice and I think that's the direction that the British government is following today. I think that the inspiration of the New Deal and its experiment is responsible for much change — much of it for the better—throughout the world. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Congressman Hinshaw has a comment on that.

Congressman Hinshaw: May I add to the comment of Mr. Welles that about a year ago certain leaders of the British Labor Party were very much instrumental in requesting that the United States approve of the cartel system. I am not quite aware of the reasons why they did that, but, nevertheless, they seemed to approve of the cartel system and said so.

Mr. Welles: May I comment on that?

Mr. Denny: Yes, Mr. Welles. Come along.

Mr. Welles: We cannot be responsible for all the leadership of

the Labor Government any more than I would speak for all the leadership of the New Deal. I certainly am not in favor of cartels, and I don't want you to think that I am, and I believe that the rank and file of the Labor Party and the great masses of the British people who voted out the Conservative Party are against cartels and all monopolistic practice. (*Applause.*)

Congressman Hinshaw: And so am I.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Hinshaw, what was that?

Congressman Hinshaw: And so am I not in favor.

Man: What about the NRA? (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Denny: Here's a man with a good, strong voice. He says "How about the NRA?" I thought that bird was dead. (*Laughter.*) The gentleman in the black shirt.

Man: Mr. Neylan. Do you think that under the new English government that the common citizenry will be more fairly represented in government than they were under the Churchill government?

Mr. Denny: Mr. Neylan, did you get that?

Mr. Neylan: Yes. My honest opinion is they will not be for this reason. The British Isles have practically no natural resources worth the name. They have an excess population of 20 million

people. They have to get food there every day to feed them, and you may say what you want about the British financiers and industrialists, but they are the ones who have exploited the resources of the rest of the earth to get the food into England to feed the excess population of 20 million people every day. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman in the balcony.

Man: My question is for Representative Hinshaw. As you know the British Armed Forces gave the Labor Party in England an overwhelming majority—much, much greater than the civilian population of England. Surely there must be some significance for that overwhelming majority. I'm interested in your comment.

Congressman Hinshaw: I have no idea, particularly, why the British soldier voted as he did except, perhaps, that maybe he doesn't think that in comparison with the soldiers of the United States that he has received enough pay and perhaps another government would pay him more. I'm speaking only from the pay standpoint because I know that the British government has done all it could to take care of its soldiers just as have we, in this country.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now the gentleman in the dark suit under the balcony. Yes?

Man: I'd like to ask Mr. Manchester Boddy a question.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Boddy. It sounds like it's going to be a mean one.

Man: What chance, if any, would civilization have should England and America break friendly relations and international atomic warfare ensue?

Mr. Denny: I understand we can't hear you very well. I couldn't get that either.

Man: I'd like to ask Mr. Manchester Boddy his opinion on the question, what chance, if any, would civilization have should England and America break friendly relations and international atomic warfare ensue?

Mr. Denny: Well, that's a very "iffy" question, but go ahead.

Mr. Boddy: Well, I believe that our chances would be reduced tremendously below what they are already. Actually, the condition of the minds and hearts of the people of the whole civilized world are going to be called upon to handle that new explosive according to the rules of the Good Book, and forget a little bit about selfishness and self-aggrandizement, or we aren't going to have a chance even with the friendship of Britain. (Applause.)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Next question.

Lady: I wish to address my question to Orson Welles. I noticed before that one of the speakers mentioned a question regarding the influence of the New Deal

on the British elections. I would like to ask Mr. Welles how much influence do you believe Russia and Russian thinking exerted on the election in Britain?

Mr. Welles: How much do I think Russian thinking influenced the election in Britain? Not as much as my opponents in this debate would have you think, because the common man in Britain has not abandoned political democracy, and it is in this direction that our Russian comrades are a trifle weak. If they are moving toward economic democracy, we may say that they are influenced by Russia and by the success of the Russian Red Army. But we can be very sure that they are influenced by their own thinking which goes back to Sidney and Beatrice Webb.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman on the side balcony 'way over there. Yes?

Man: My question is addressed to Mr. Neylan. Will you deny that your so-called British master minds were largely responsible for Hitler and his activities. (Applause and shouts.)

Mr. Denny: Mr. Neylan.

Mr. Neylan: This is the first time I have ever been associated by anybody with British master minds. (Laughter.) On the contrary, I have usually been accused of being anti-British. However, I do not get hysterical one way or the other about the British. I

have learned long since that they are very able people, that with the know-how which they have and their tremendous experience they built a tremendous Empire, in exploiting the resources of others. What I'm concerned about today is to get jobs, real jobs, not political speech jobs. In order to get industry going, I say that instead of killing industry, let us encourage it all over the world. Let us get the cooperation of those men in Britain who have built magnificent industry. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Mr. Neylan, I don't know what purpose there may be behind this question but, as moderator, I wonder if you want to tackle the question as the gentleman asked it. What responsibility these British people had for Hitler—I think, perhaps, you want to comment on that. I suppose he means Munich and Chamberlain.

Mr. Neylan: Well, of course, at Munich we had the shameful situation of the civilized world appeasing an absolute government. The most hateful thing on earth, in my opinion, is absolute government. On the other hand, we haven't got through appeasing. Whether those British industrialists were in league with Hitler or not, I don't know. If they were, there's no condemnation too strong for them.

Mr. Denny: All right. Thank you. The sergeant here.

Man: Congressman Hinshaw. Sir, you spoke of the 1940 election and the fear of a day longer of war. Was it the fear of a day longer of war that elected our present Administration in '32, '36, and '40, or was it, perhaps, a fear of a day longer of unemployment? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: That's a nice political question, Congressman. You ought to be used to that.

Congressman Hinshaw: Yes, I'm used to that sort of a question because we get those in the House of Representatives every day, when somebody on my side of the House makes a decent and fair statement. As a matter of fact in 1932, especially, the people of the United States wanted a change and they got it, and they're going to get another one before very long.

Mr. Denny: All right, thank you, Mr. Hinshaw. The gentleman here.

Mr. Neylan: Mr. Denny.

Mr. Denny: Yes, Mr. Neylan.

Mr. Neylan: May I make a suggestion in that connection? If you will recall, in 1939, after an expenditure of billions and billions and bales of political promises, we had more unemployed people in the United States than we had in 1932.

Mr. Denny: All right, sir. We got the comment. The gentleman here.

Man: Orson Welles. Don't you think that the Labor Party victory in England will result in England's

closer collaboration with communistic Russia and away from the United States?

Mr. Welles: I hope that the first part of your statement is true. I hope that the second part of it isn't. I hope it will result in closer collaboration of all the winner nations in the interests of world peace and of an abundant and prosperous future for your children and mine. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Orson Welles, Manchester Boddy, Congressman Hinshaw, and John Francis Neylan. You've opened the door for a great deal of straight thinking by all of us and several more Town Meeting programs. But before we announce next week's topic, here's an important message for every American.

Announcer: President Truman considers the present food situation so critical that he has made this appeal:

"There is a threefold need for more food today than ever before. Supply lines to feed our troops are the longest in the history of warfare. Soldiers in Europe are changing from combat rations to regular meals. We must aid liberated peoples until they can feed themselves. I call upon every American to discharge his obligation in helping to swell the Nation's food supply."

An article in a recent issue of *The Reader's Digest* explains why reconstruction of the destitute Europe is as important to America

and lasting peace as is military victory. It reports all too vividly how urgent is the need for food over there. To meet this demand, farmers must set an all-time food production record, though faced with the most serious labor shortage since the beginning of the war.

Consequently, four million volunteer crop corps workers are needed to assist the regular farm labor forces in harvesting the vital 1945 crop. Last year thousands of people who had never worked on farms before spent their vacations or spare time helping to produce and harvest the country's food supply. These people and millions more are urged to respond to the crop corps call again this summer. Work for the United States Crop Corps is war work and is paid for at prevailing farm wages.

Everyone, with or without farm experience, can help. No matter where you live—in a large city or in the country—and regardless of how little time you may have to give, if you're able to volunteer for the remainder of the summer, get in touch with your county agricultural agent or your local farm employment office now.

You can volunteer for only a few days or even a few hours per day. Wait for the local call in your own community.

Now, for the announcement of next week's discussion, *The Reader's Digest* returns you to Mr. Denny.

Mr. Denny: Next week your

Town Meeting will originate at the Santa Ana Air Base where we'll present a program in connection with the conference on veterans' problems being conducted by the Army Air Forces Army Distribution Command in cooperation with the University of California in Los Angeles.

While we recognize your great interest in world affairs at this crucial time, we know that you realize, also, the tremendous importance of our dealing wisely with the returning soldiers who bore and are bearing the brunt of our war effort.

Before an audience composed

largely of men who've seen service overseas, we'll discuss the question—"Will the Returning Soldiers Be a Problem?" Our speakers will be the Honorable Earl Warren, Governor of California; Lieutenant Jackie Coogan, who has just returned from overseas; Major Ted Lawson, co-author of *Thirty Seconds Over Tokyo*, and one of the heroes of the Doolittle flight; and Captain Clarence Franz, chaplain with the Wildcat Division of the 81st Infantry.

Announcer: So be sure to tune in next week when *The Reader's Digest* brings you—Town Meeting.



Reg. U.S. Pat. Off.

Town Meeting Bulletin

ISSUES NOW IN STOCK

Order by number from the list below while they last—

VOLUME 10

33. Should Corporation Taxes Be Abolished?
34. Should the Allies Maintain a Hands-Off Policy in Liberated Countries?
35. Should All Germans Be Punished for Nazi Crimes and Atrocities?
36. Should We Support Russia's Plans for Poland?
37. Is Communism a Threat to the American Way of Life?
38. What Should Be America's War and Peace Aims?
39. Do We Want Universal Military Training for Youth?
40. Should Congress Pass a Work or Fight Bill?
42. Results of the Big Three Conference.
45. Can France Regain Her Place as a World Power?
46. How Should We Deal With a Defeated Japan?
49. Are Britain and America Headed for a Trade War After Victory?
50. Are the Rights of the Small Nations Protected Under Dumbarton Oaks?
51. Can We Build a Lasting Peace Now?

VOLUME 11

1. Is War Impairing Our Moral Standards?
2. What Next in Europe?
3. Are National Planning and Government Control a Threat to Democracy?
4. Are We Solving America's Race Problem?
5. Russia and America—Postwar Rivals or Allies?
6. Should the Lid Be Kept On Prices During Postwar Reconversion?
8. Should the Big 5 Veto Power Be Included in the World Charter?
9. Should We Accept the San Francisco Charter?
10. Should We Have Universal Military Training After the War?
11. Should the Government Be Responsible for Continuing Full Employment?
12. Should Congress Provide Health and Old Age Insurance for All?
13. Should War Veterans Have Job Preference?
14. How Can Russia and America Live in Peace?

Order single copies at 10c each from TOWN HALL, INC.,
123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N. Y.

Any Twenty-six Issues of Town Meeting Bulletin Will Be Sent at This Special Low Subscription Rate:

Any 26 Weeks Only
\$2.35
Single Copies 10c